REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, and 14-16 are now present in this application, of which claims 1, 7, and 12 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal by overcoming the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection, the only pending rejection.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the overflow oil passage that is formed in the tank wall partition and the overflow oil passage wall extending parallel to the tank partition wall as recited in claims 1, 7, and 12 are not shown in the drawings.

In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to replace the language cited by the Examiner with "an overflow oil passage formed by said tank partition wall and said overflow oil passage wall, said overflow oil passage wall extending substantially parallel to said tank partition wall." Support for this claim amendment may be found, for example, in Figures 10 and 11.

Accordingly, no outstanding issues remain with respect to the drawings.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the original specification does not disclose an overflow oil passage formed in said tank partition wall and said overflow oil passage wall extending substantially parallel to said tank partition wall, as recited in claims 1, 7, and 12.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 12 to recite "an overflow oil passage formed by said tank partition wall and said overflow oil passage wall, said overflow oil passage wall extending substantially parallel to said tank partition wall." Support for this amendment can be seen in Figs. 10 and 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are fully supported by and adequately described in the written description of the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

James M. Slattery
Registration No.: 28,380
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants